DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 177 RC 008 405

AUTHOR	Olsen, Duane A.; Kuehn, John A.
TITLE	Migrant Response to Industrialization in Four Rural Areas, 1965-70. Agricultural Economic Report No. 270.
INSTITUTION	Missouri Univ., Columbia. Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY	Economic Research Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	AER-270
PUB DATE	Sep 74
NOTE	33p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Age; *Employment Patterns; Income; *Industrialization; *Migrants; Migration Patterns; Population Trends; *Rural Areas; Rural Development; Socioeconomic Influences; *Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	Arizona; Arkansas; Central Ozarks; Mississippi

ABSTRACT

Immigrants competed on a limited scale with residents for new jobs in four industrializing rural areas in Arizona, the Central Ozarks, Mississippi, and Arkansas during 1965-70. This study determined: (1) competition for jobs between residents and immigrants; (2) need for immigrants to staff industries; and (3) differences between attributes of employed residents and immigrants. The four multicounty areas were selected because they represented varying types of rural areas, had similarly strong rates of industrialization, exhibited differences in age levels and employment patterns, and had substantial increases in nonfarm employment from 1962 to 1968. Questionnaires were administered to 1,275 employees from 26 plants which had either been established or had experienced considerable expansion since 1965. The plants included 5 apparel, 5 nonelectrical machinery, 5 electrical equipment, 3 food products, and 8 other types. Among the findings were (1) about 22 percent of the jobs surveyed were obtained by new and returning immigrants, although there apparently was sufficient excess labor locally to fill most positions; (2) in general, immigrants tended to be younger and have more education than residents and were more likely to fill the managerial positions; and (3) factors such as proximity of other family members and more pleasant living conditions influenced many workers to migrate or return. (Author/NQ)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MIGRANT RESPONSE TO INDUSTRIALIZATION IN FOUR RURAL AREAS, 1965-70

RECEIVED
APR 2 1975
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED103177
CG008405

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

IN COOPERATION WITH

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIC REPORT NO. 270

ABSTRACT

Inmigrants competed on a limited scale with residents for new jobs in four industrializing rural areas in Arizona, the Central Ozarks, Mississippi, and Arkansas during 1965-70. About 22 percent of the jobs surveyed were obtained by new and returning inmigrants, although there apparently was sufficient excess labor locally to fill most positions. In general, inmigrants tended to be younger and to have more education than residents, and they were more likely to fill the managerial positions.

Factors other than monetary benefits, including proximity of other family members and more pleasant living conditions, influenced many workers to migrate or return.

Key words: Rural areas, employment, industrial development, migration, T-case study, Arizona, Coastal Plains, Mississippi Delta, Ozarks.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was a cooperative effort of the Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the University of Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station. It was part of a larger project concerning the impact of job development on poverty. We are particularly indebted to Lloyd D. Bender of the Economic Research Service, who directed the job impact project and organized much of the data. Sincere appreciation is also extended to John Crecink, Bernal L. Green, and Herbert Hoover of the Economic Research Service for interviewing and analyzing questionnaires and also to Curtis Braschler and Robert Bevins of the University of Missouri for guidance and preparation of this study.

Washington, D.C. 20250 September 1974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

	Page
HIGHLIGHTS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
Four Study Areas	2
Research Methods	3
INDUSTRY'S NEED FOR MIGRANTS AND RETURNEES	3
DIFFERENCES IN EMPLOYEES' ATTRIBUTES	4
Salaries and Incomes	4
Socioeconomic Characteristics	5
POLICY IMPLICATIONS	6

TABLES

Number

1--Population distribution by race and age, and urban center, four study areas, 1970	7
2--Population changes and employment patterns, four study areas, 1960-70	8
3--Employees, by resident and migrant class, four study areas	9
4--Total unemployment and number of experienced unemployed, by selected occupations, four study areas, 1960 and 1970	9
5--Employees' weekly salary, by resident and migrant class, four study areas, 1970	10
6--Employees with working spouses, by resident and migrant class, four study areas, 1970	10
7--Real change in employees' weekly salary, 1970 job and first previous job, by resident and migrant class, four study areas	11
8--Real change in employees' annual household income, 1970 job and first previous job, by resident and migrant class, four study areas	12
9--Number of civilian jobs held by employees from 1965 to 1970, by resident and migrant class, four study areas	13
10--Employees' reasons for leaving previous job, by resident and migrant class, four study areas	14
11--Employees' ages, by resident and migrant class, four study areas, 1970	15
12--Employees' years of formal education, by resident and migrant class, four study areas, 1970	16
13--Commuting distances of employees, by resident and migrant class, four study areas, 1970	17

0004

HIGHLIGHTS

Inmigrants competed on a limited scale with local residents for new jobs in four industrializing Southern rural areas in 1965-70. This study of four multicounty areas in Arizona, Mississippi, the central Ozarks, and Arkansas. indicated that about 78 percent of the surveyed job opportunities went to local residents. The remaining 22 percent were about equally divided between new and returning inmigrants. With the possible exception of trained management personnel, the new jobs could probably have been filled by local workers, as there were substantial numbers of unemployed in all four areas in 1960 and 1970.

From 1962 to 1968, nonfarm private employment in the four areas increased 52 percent in Arizona and Mississippi, 59 percent in the Ozarks, and 60 percent in the Delta. To evaluate the effect of this industrialization, employees in 26 new or expanded plants were asked to fill out questionnaires. On the basis of their responses, the researchers concluded that over a fifth of the new jobs went to new or returning inmigrants, who usually received higher salaries in their new jobs than did residents, and by implication were more productive. But about 38 percent of the inmigrants received salaries only equal to or smaller than they had previously received. In general, residents received greater salary gains over their previous jobs than inmigrants.

Inmigrants were generally younger, better educated, lived closer to their new jobs, and had shown greater job mobility in previous years than residents. These characteristics gave them competitive advantages over residents. Monetary or occupational advantages were the paramount incentive for job switching among both residents and inmigrants, but a significant number of the latter were also motivated by nonmonetary considerations such as better living conditions or family well-being.

Judging from the findings of the study, rural industrialization programs emphasizing residents' welfare are likely to experience some leakage of jobs to inmigrants. However, inmigration of young, better educated workers might help revitalize declining rural areas and new job opportunities might slow the exodus of young people, and also better the situation for older workers.

0005

MIGRANT RESPONSE TO INDUSTRIALIZATION IN FOUR RURAL AREAS, 1965-70

by

Duane A. Olsen and John A. Kuehn 1/

INTRODUCTION

Providing more jobs through industrial growth is an important part of most rural development programs. Availability of new jobs tends to reduce the level of rural outmigration and increase residents' economic well-being. It has been assumed that the supply of unemployed and underemployed agricultural workers has been an important factor in industrialists' selection of factory sites. Extended periods of new outmigration have been common to many rural areas.

Increasing age levels and declining populations have led to the suggestion that inmigration of workers may be a necessary element in industrialization. However, inmigrants compete with residents for new jobs. Such competition could take away jobs and higher incomes from rural residents, particularly in areas with nigh unemployment and underemployment levels. 2/ On the other hand, research has indicated that young, educated people are more likely to migrate than older or less educated people. 3/ Given the patterns of past outmigration from rural areas, the socioeconomic attributes of rural inmigrants may be important determinants of future economic viability of the community and the potential productivity of the rural labor force.

The objectives of this study were to determine: (1) Competition for jobs between residents and inmigrants, (2) need for inmigrants to staff industries, and (3) differences between attributes of employed residents and inmigrants. Data were obtained by interviewing employees of new and expanded plants in four developing rural areas.

1/ The authors are currently Associate Professor, University of Nebraska; and Agricultural Economist, Economic Development Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Dept. of Agr., University of Missouri-Columbia. Work was performed when Olsen was at the University of Missouri.

2/ Bender, Lloyd D., Bernal L. Green, and Rex R. Campbell. Trickle-down and Leakage in the War on Poverty: Growth and Change, 1971. For results of this study concerning antipoverty goals, see: Kuehn, John A., Lloyd D. Bender, Bernal L. Green, and Herbert Hoover. Impact of Job Development on Poverty in Four Developing Areas, 1970. U.S. Dept. of Agr., AER-225, 1972.

3/ Beale, Calvin L. Demographic and Social Considerations for U.S. Rural Economic Policy. Amer. Jour. Agr. Econ., May 1969; and Bird, Alan R. Migration and Its Effect on Agriculture and Rural Development Potential. In The Labor Force: Migration, Earnings, and Growth. Tennessee Valley Authority, 1972.

0006

Four Study Areas

Four multicounty areas with substantial increases in nonfarm employment from 1962 to 1968 were studied. These areas (hereafter identified as Arizona, Upper Coastal, Ozarks, and the Delta) were representative of varying types of rural areas. They contained counties in northeastern Arizona, northeastern Mississippi, the central Ozarks, and the Mississippi Delta in Arkansas (table 1). From 1962 to 1968, private nonfarm employment in counties with surveyed plants increased 52 percent in Arizona, 52 percent in the Upper Coastal area, 59 percent in the Ozarks, and 60 percent in the Delta. Although the four areas had similarly strong rates of industrialization, they showed substantial variation in other socioeconomic characteristics.

Populations increased in Arizona, Upper Coastal, and the Ozarks during 1960-70, but declined in the Delta. Only the Ozarks area gained population because of net inmigration; however, all four areas had some gross inmigration. In Arizona and the Upper Coastal areas, natural increases (births less deaths) offset net outmigration. Gross inmigration by county from 1965 to 1970 was greatest in the Ozarks area, where 23 percent of the 1970 population had moved across county lines during those 5 years (table 2). 4/ In contrast, only 10 percent of the population in the Upper Coastal and Delta areas and about 15 percent in the Arizona area had lived in a different county in 1965. Cultural forces seemed to affect migration patterns in both the Arizona and Delta areas, where American Indians represented 52 percent and Negroes 45 percent of the 1970 populations, respectively.

The four study areas also exhibited differences in age levels and employment patterns. First, the prevalence of people under 20 years of age was evident in Arizona and the Delta, where median county age levels did not exceed 21 and 26 years, respectively. In the Upper Coastal and the Ozarks areas, median age levels in many counties exceeded 30 years. Second, the estimated unemployment level was relatively low for the Ozarks area, but was high for the Delta. Arizona and the Upper Coastal areas had relatively moderate unemployment levels. Third, the distribution pattern of employment among industries in the Ozarks was similar to the national pattern. Employment in the Upper Coastal area was highly oriented to manufacturing; in Arizona, only 10 percent of the employees were in manufacturing in 1970. About 17 percent of the Delta employees were agricultural.

Most of the counties in the four study areas were rural in character, with towns of less than 8,000 population in 1970. The Arizona area was more than 100 miles from a metropolitan city; its largest city had a population of about 22,000. The Upper Coastal area was about 100 miles from a metropolitan center; its largest city had a population of about 11,500. The Delta and Ozarks areas were about 50 miles from metropolitan centers. The Delta's largest city had

4/ These figures include intercounty moves within the study areas, plus moves from counties outside the study areas; they do not represent gross inmigration into the multicounty study areas.

about 12,500 people. The Ozarks area's largest city had about 30,700 people; 8,500 of these were college students. Five counties in the Ozarks area had no centers of 2,500 people or more.

Research Methods

In the four study areas, 56 plants were identified which had 20 or more employees in 1969 and had either been established or had experienced considerable expansion since 1965. The 26 plants that agreed to cooperate in the study included 5 apparel, 5 nonelectrical machinery, 5 electrical equipment, 3 food products, and 8 other types. Cooperating plant managers were asked to allow interviews with at least 25 percent of their employees, including management. The 25-percent sample was drawn randomly within skill strata. About 19 percent of the total estimated employees (1,275 out of 6,729) returned usable questionnaires; however, the return rate varied by plant. Sample data were expanded for each plant separately to reflect total estimated employment. Area data represent a summation of expanded data for the plants therein.

INDUSTRY'S NEED FOR MIGRANTS AND RETURNEES

Overall, migrants and returnees competed on a limited scale with local residents for new jobs during 1965-70. 5/ About 22 percent of the surveyed jobs in all four areas were held by migrants and returnees (table 3). In Arizona, about three-fourths of the jobs were held by residents, one-eighth by migrants, and one-eighth by returnees. In the Upper Coastal Area, residents held about four-fifths of the jobs; returnees held most of the rest. In the Ozarks, migrants competed most seriously with residents. Only two-thirds of the jobs were held by residents; almost a fifth were held by migrants and an eighth by returnees. In the Delta, migrants and returnees represented only small proportions of total estimated employment at surveyed plants.

Table 4 suggests that there was an adequate supply of experienced but unemployed labor in each area to satisfy labor demands of new and expanding plants. Inmigration to augment the labor force did not appear to be necessary, except perhaps in the managerial category. Earnings data in table 5 suggest that about a fifth of the migrants held managerial jobs. Experienced, unemployed managers in each study area, and especially in the Arizona and Upper Coastal areas, may have lacked the specific skills and familiarity with company operations required by the new and expanding plants. For other occupational categories, especially operatives, migrants and returnees apparently were hired in lieu of experienced, unemployed residents, thereby blocking the latters' opportunities to participate directly in rural industrialization.

Overall, migrants and returnees held about 22 percent, or 1,469, of the jobs surveyed in the four study areas. In addition, about 43 percent of the migrants' and returnees' spouses were employed, accounting for 631 jobs (table 6). In Arizona and Upper Coastal, residents and returnees were more likely

5/ Resident workers were nonmovers and movers, within the study areas only, between June 1965 and the end of 1970. Migrants included all those who moved for the first time into the study area after June 1965. Returnees were persons who moved into the study area after June 1965, but had lived there before.

to have employed spouses. In the Ozarks and Delta, migrants were more likely than residents or returnees to have employed spouses.

DIFFERENCES IN EMPLOYEES' ATTRIBUTES

Although the four study areas were not homogeneous labor markets, each seemed to offer ample supplies of experienced but unemployed residents at various skill levels. Consequently, it was considered appropriate to further examine differences in talents and job accessibility among workers. Various factors were selected for identifying differences among residents, migrants, and returnees. 6/ These were weekly salary, change in real salary, education, age, commuting distance, and measures of job mobility. These factors are discussed below, along with the respondents' appraisals of the primary motive for their most recent job transfer.

Salaries and Incomes

Migrants received larger weekly salaries than returnees and residents; the average difference was $20 per week for all areas combined. Returnees received about the same average salaries as residents in all four areas combined. However, there were differences among areas. Distribution of earnings was skewed toward migrants; a large share of them earned $140 or more per week (see table 5). This implies that new and expanded plants frequently imported managerial talent. In Arizona, migrants generally earned more than returnees; residents had the lowest weekly salaries. In the Upper Coastal area, migrants earned more than returnees and residents, whose average salaries were about equal. In the Ozarks, all three groups received similar salaries. In the Delta, migrants received the highest salaries, and residents received more than returnees. If salaries indicate productivity and skill levels, returnees and residents were apparently about equally skilled, and migrants were more skilled than either residents or returnees.

Migrants tended to receive higher weekly salaries than residents, but residents made greater improvements in their earnings from their previous jobs than either migrants or returnees (table 7). Part of this difference might be due to levels of unemployment or underemployment in these areas. About 38 percent of the migrants and returnees received the same or lower weekly earnings than they had received elsewhere. This situation was particularly evident for returnees in the Upper Coastal area, for migrants in the Ozarks, and for both groups in the Delta. Perhaps they thought nonmonetary benefits, such as the area's environment or life in a small town, outweighed monetary benefits in their overall welfare. 7/

Changes in real annual household income included not only changes in respondents' salaries but also changes in salaries for other household members, property incomes, and transfer payments. In the Upper Coastal and Delta areas,

6/ Olsen, Duane A. The Inmigrant Response to the Industrialization of Four Distressed Regions. Ph.D. Dissertation: Univ. of Mo. Agr. Econ. Dept., 1973.

7/ Bender, Lloyd D. and Richard Stroup Evaluating Labor's Revealed Preferences for Amenities. Presented, Regional Science Association, Mid-continent Section Meeting, Stillwater, Oklahoma, April 13, 1973.

0003

residents increased their household incomes more than migrants and returnees (table 8). In the Ozarks, residents and returnees did about equally well, and both received greater increases than migrants. In Arizona, even though many responses were inconclusive, migrants and returnees seemed to fare better than residents. Overall, residents increased their household incomes more than migrants and returnees, many of whom received lower incomes than previously.

Socioeconomic Characteristics

Migrants and returnees had changed jobs more frequently and had moved into their 1970 jobs with shorter periods of unemployment than resident workers. Larger salary increases for residents, but at lower salary levels, were noted earlier. Residents were unemployed prior to their present jobs for periods averaging more than twice as long as either migrants or returnees. From 1965 to 1970, migrants had held a greater number of different jobs than returnees, who in turn had held more jobs than residents (table 9). Migrants and returnees exhibited greater mobility in moving to their current jobs than residents did.

Although most workers were prompted to leave their previous jobs for monetary or occupational reasons, many migrants and returnees in the Upper Coastal and Ozarks areas were motivated by nonmonetary reasons. Respondents were asked to identify their primary reason for leaving their previous job. Responses were grouped into eight categories (table 10). Three categories were considered directly related to job opportunities--the pull of promotion or transfer, the push created by being fired or laid off, and dissatisfaction with their previous jobs. Motives considered primarily nonmonetary related to military separation or graduation, the desire for an improved living quality, health, and family reasons such as marriage or pregnancy. Monetary motives associated with the pull of a new job or the push from an old one were of prime importance to workers in each migrant class. In Arizona, some returnees were also motivated by family matters. In the Upper Coastal and Ozarks areas, many migrants and returnees were motivated by family matters and living conditions. In the Delta, however, most migrants and returnees left their previous jobs for monetary or occupational reasons.

Education and age are frequently used to appraise employees' potential productivity. In all areas except the Delta, migrants' and returnees' ages were lower and educational levels were higher than residents'. In Arizona, Upper Coastal, and the Ozarks, about half or more of the migrants and returnees were less than 30 years old (table 11). In Arizona, returnees were generally younger than residents, who in turn were younger than migrants. In the Upper Coastal area, migrants were usually younger than returnees and residents. In the Ozarks, returnees were more likely to be younger than migrants, who in turn were younger than residents. On the other hand, residents in the Delta were often younger than migrants and returnees.

In all areas except the Delta, migrants were likely to have more years of formal education than returnees, who in turn usually had more schooling than residents (table 12). In Arizona, Upper Coastal, and the Ozarks, at least half of the migrants and returnees had completed high school; many were college graduates.

Even though migrants and returnees effectively competed with residents for jobs, their youth and additional education could benefit the four areas studied. Inmigration of such workers at least partly replaced the human capital lost in these rural areas by past outmigrations. Economic viability of these areas could be enhanced by the addition of young, educated migrants and returnees to the labor force.

Relatives living nearby was a characteristic more frequently associated with residents than migrants. However, a high proportion of workers in each group unexpectedly reported relatives living nearby. In each area, the proximity of relatives appears to have motivated the mobility of migrants and returnees.

Laborsheds were quite extensive in all four areas. Reported commuting distances indicated that many employees lived considerably beyond the boundaries of communities with new or expanded employment. In the Upper Coastal, Delta, and Ozarks areas, migrants were more likely than residents to live close to their places of employment (table 13). In Arizona, the commuting pattern was more diversified, probably because of Indian reservations.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Rural industrialization programs focusing on improvement of residents' welfare could expect some leakage of jobs to inmigrants, judging from these case studies. About 22 percent of the new job opportunities in the four study areas were obtained by migrants and returnees, whose productivity (measured by salary levels), age, education, economic motivation, and mobility, and commuting distance gave them comparative advantages over residents. Nevertheless, residents achieved larger salary increases. Inmigration to augment the labor force did not appear essential to industrialization, except perhaps for managerial skills.

Rural industrialization programs emphasizing community development and population distribution could help revitalize declining areas, judging from these case studies. Rural communities suffering from the exodus of young people could benefit by the inmigration of young, educated workers. Also, many migrants and returnees moved to the study area for nonmonetary reasons. Environmental and sociological factors were evident in the responses of those who listed health, living conditions, and family reasons as motives for their recent job transfers. Nonmonetary benefits are important factors in many migration decisions and may compensate the worker for lower or stable monetary benefits.

0011

Table 1--Population distribution by race and age, and urban center, four study areas, 1970

Study areas and counties 1/	Population, 1970								
	Total	Race		Age				Urban	
		Percent Indian	Percent Negro	Median	Percent 20-34	Percent 35-49	Percent 50-64	Percent	Largest city
Arizona	175,588	52.3	1.2	19.3	18.9	14.9	9.9	32.3	21,979
Apache, Ariz	32,304	74.3	1.3	17.5	18.9	13.2	8.8	0.0	1,320
Navajo, Ariz	47,559	48.3	1.9	18.9	18.2	14.1	10.6	26.9	8,066
McKinley, N.M.	43,208	61.3	0.9	18.5	20.1	14.7	9.1	42.9	14,596
San Juan, N.M.	52,517	35.1	0.6	20.6	18.4	17.0	10.6	48.3	21,979
Upper Coastal	163,721	2/ --	15.7	30.5	18.0	16.1	16.5	26.3	11,581
Alcorn, Miss	27,179	0.1	11.8	30.6	19.8	16.6	16.1	42.6	11,581
Benton, Miss	7,505	--	42.0	25.0	15.2	14.4	15.1	0.0	354
Prentiss, Miss	20,133	0.0	11.7	29.9	18.4	16.1	16.6	29.3	5,895
Tippah, Miss	15,852	--	16.3	30.3	17.7	15.4	16.6	22.0	3,482
Tishomingo, Miss	14,940	--	4.4	31.9	18.1	16.7	17.2	0.0	2,389
Union, Miss	19,096	--	15.4	30.7	18.0	15.7	16.8	33.7	6,426
Hardeman, Tenn	22,435	--	38.4	29.8	16.1	15.2	16.2	29.7	6,674
Hardin, Tenn	18,212	--	5.7	31.3	18.4	17.1	16.3	30.6	5,576
McNairy, Tenn	18,369	0.1	6.8	32.4	18.5	16.7	17.3	18.2	3,495
Ozarks	214,462	3.8	0.3	30.0	19.7	15.2	16.0	34.4	30,729
Benton, Ark	50,476	0.5	--	31.7	18.4	15.5	16.7	45.0	16,783
Carroll, Ark	12,301	0.1	--	38.9	15.2	15.4	19.6	0.0	2,271
Madison, Ark	9,453	0.1	--	35.2	15.4	16.2	18.2	0.0	1,287
Washington, Ark	77,370	0.2	0.8	25.4	25.9	14.9	12.7	60.6	30,729
Barry, Mo	19,597	0.1	--	37.5	14.8	15.5	19.0	21.2	5,937
McDonald, Mo	12,357	0.8	--	35.2	15.4	15.7	18.8	0.0	1,065
Adair, Okla	15,141	27.4	--	29.6	15.7	15.1	15.9	0.0	2,134
Delaware, Okla	17,767	19.8	0.1	36.3	14.1	14.9	19.8	0.0	2,000
Delta	69,466	0.1	44.5	23.8	16.6	13.9	13.3	36.6	12,521
Cross, Ark	19,783	--	27.8	25.5	17.6	14.4	13.8	33.8	6,696
Lee, Ark	18,884	0.1	57.6	22.7	14.6	13.4	13.1	32.8	6,196
St. Francis, Ark	30,799	--	47.3	23.3	17.2	13.8	13.1	40.7	12,521

1/ Plants surveyed were in Navajo and Apache counties, Arizona; San Juan county, New Mexico; Alcorn and Tippah counties, Mississippi; Benton, Lee, St. Francis, and Washington counties, Arkansas.

2/ -- = negligible.

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1970, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Final Report PC (1)C; County and City Data Book, 1972; Bureau of the Census, U.S. Dept. of Commerce.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2--Population changes and employment patterns, four study areas, 1960-70

Study areas and counties 1/	Population change, 1960-70	Migration		Civilian employment, 1970			
		Net, 1960-70	1965 residence, different county	Total 2/	Percent in		
					Manufacturing	Trades	Services
Arizona	16,641	-38,687	26,695	44,555	10.4	19.4	7.2
Apache, Ariz.	1,866	-12,651	3,702	6,266	8.1	14.1	5.4
Navajo, Ariz.	9,565	-4,537	7,604	11,853	13.8	18.9	8.6
McKinley, N.M.	5,999	-7,442	5,237	11,277	9.3	22.6	6.6
San Juan, N.M.	-789	-14,057	10,152	15,159	9.4	19.6	7.2
Upper Coastal	7,882	-6,623	16,873	57,112	40.9	15.2	6.8
Alcorn, Miss.	1,897	-308	2,735	9,793	42.3	17.0	7.4
Benton, Miss.	-218	-1,282	859	2,251	35.0	10.3	7.6
Prentiss, Miss.	2,184	387	2,028	7,735	44.6	15.1	6.4
Tippah, Miss.	759	-822	1,642	5,747	36.9	14.2	6.2
Tishomingo, Miss.	1,051	154	1,772	5,042	45.3	15.4	7.2
Union, Miss.	192	-1,325	2,087	6,982	40.8	16.1	6.9
Hardeman, Tenn.	918	-2,103	2,390	6,702	35.8	13.0	7.9
Hardin, Tenn.	815	-548	1,915	6,669	39.4	17.1	6.2
McNairy, Tenn.	284	-776	1,445	6,191	43.7	14.5	5.5
Ozarks	45,012	31,933	50,490	75,657	27.1	18.5	6.4
Benton, Ark.	14,204	11,884	12,630	18,907	35.1	17.1	5.2
Carroll, Ark.	1,017	713	2,521	4,494	25.3	19.9	7.5
Madison, Ark.	385	-147	1,553	3,043	26.2	13.3	5.8
Washington, Ark.	21,573	14,222	22,031	29,557	21.6	20.0	6.9
Barry, Mo.	676	337	3,089	6,778	30.3	19.9	7.2
McDonald, Mo.	559	170	2,517	4,185	33.1	17.5	5.4
Adair, Okla.	2,029	794	2,079	3,932	28.1	17.5	6.4
Delaware, Okla.	4,569	3,960	4,070	4,761	20.4	16.5	7.9
Delta	-4,389	-18,969	6,726	19,508	26.7	17.5	8.5
Cross, Ark.	232	-2,580	2,522	6,296	28.8	17.1	8.0
Lee, Ark.	-2,117	-6,508	1,322	4,298	26.1	14.8	7.2
St. Francis, Ark.	-2,504	-9,881	2,882	8,914	25.6	19.1	9.5

1/ Plants surveyed were in Navajo and Apache counties, Arizona; San Juan county, New Mexico; Alcorn and Tippah counties, Mississippi; Benton, Lee, St. Francis, and Washington counties, Arkansas.

2/ Unemployment figures given in table 4 for each study area.

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1970, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Final Report PC (1)C; Components of Population Change by County: 1960 to 1970, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 461; County and City Data Book, 1972; Bureau of the Census, U.S. Dept. of Commerce.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

0014

0014

Table 3--Employees, by resident and migrant class, four study areas

Study area	Residents 1/			Migrants				Returnees					Total
	Total	Non-movers	Moved within area	Total	From same state	From adja-cent state	From nonadja-cent state	Total	From same state	From adja-cent state	From nonadja-cent state	Undeter-mined	
						Number 2/							
Arizona	948	658	291	173	33	89	51	132	36	85	11	17	1,270
Upper Coastal	2,103	1,681	422	131	10	63	58	339	46	154	140	27	2,600
Ozarks	1,332	982	351	372	17	159	197	252	9	171	73	24	1,980
Delta	808	688	120	38	0	14	24	33	5	0	29	0	879
Total	5,192	4,009	1,184	713	60	324	330	756	95	410	251	67	6,729
						Percent 3/							
Arizona	74.6	51.8	22.9	13.6	2.6	7.0	4.0	10.4	2.8	6.7	0.9	1.3	100.0
Upper Coastal	80.9	64.7	16.2	5.0	0.4	2.4	2.2	13.0	1.8	5.9	5.4	1.0	100.0
Ozarks	67.3	49.6	17.7	18.8	0.9	8.0	9.9	12.7	0.5	8.6	3.7	1.2	100.0
Delta	91.9	78.3	13.7	4.3	0.0	1.6	2.7	3.8	0.6	0.0	3.3	0.0	100.0
Combined areas	77.2	59.6	17 6	10.6	0.9	4.8	4.9	11.2	1.4	6.1	3.7	1.0	100.0

1/ Residents included nonmovers and movers within the study area only between June 1965 and the end of 1970. Migrants included all those who moved into the study area for the first time. Returnees were persons who moved into the study area but had lived there before.

2/ Items may not add to total because of rounding; sample expanded by plants.

3/ Percentages calculated from rounded data.

Table 4--Total unemployme.t and number of experienced unemployed, by selected occupations, four study areas, 1960 and 1970

Unemployed	Arizona		Upper Coastal		Ozarks		Delta		Total	
	1960	1970	1960	1970	1960	1970	1960	1970	1960	1970
						Number				
Total	4,061	3,467	3,117	3,653	2,630	3,140	1,404	2,381	11,212	12,641
Experienced unemployed:										
Professional and managerial	191	144	280	145	184	263	89	51	744	603
Clerical	168	232	105	228	200	304	77	127	550	891
Craftsmen and foremen	344	648	385	478	432	462	89	168	1,250	1,756
Operatives	630	710	1,160	1,706	762	1,048	269	924	2,821	4,388
Nonfarm laborers	1,544	614	340	375	294	346	127	214	2,305	1,549

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1960 and 1970 General Social and Economic Characteristics, Final Report PC (1)-C, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Dept of Commerce.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5--Employees' weekly salary, by resident and migrant class, four study areas, 1970

Weekly salary, 1970	Arizona			Upper Coastal			Ozarks			Delta			Total		
	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees
Dollars							Number 1/								
40 or less	18	1	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	1	0
41-60	273	32	37	111	13	21	113	44	28	10	0	5	507	89	92
61-80	519	30	65	641	14	69	320	70	45	119	10	10	1,599	124	188
81-100	108	36	10	865	53	170	452	128	115	238	10	5	1,663	226	300
101-120	12	15	5	268	0	39	233	53	47	336	9	9	849	77	100
121-140	13	1	1	84	0	5	77	24	4	41	0	0	215	25	11
141 or more	5	54	13	105	50	35	87	42	13	23	9	0	220	155	61
Undetermined	0	4	0	21	0	0	50	12	0	42	0	5	112	16	5
Total	948	173	132	2,103	131	339	1,332	372	252	808	38	33	5,192	713	756
							Percent 2/								
40 or less	1.9	0.6	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.1	0.0
41-60	28.8	18.5	28.0	5.3	9.9	6.2	8.5	11.8	11.1	1.2	0.0	15.2	9.8	12.5	12.2
61-80	54.7	17.3	49.2	30.5	10.7	20.4	24.0	18.8	17.9	14.7	26.3	30.3	30.8	17.4	24.9
81-100	11.4	20.8	7.6	41.1	40.5	50.1	33.9	34.4	45.6	29.5	26.3	15.2	32.0	31.7	39.7
101-120	1.3	8.7	3.8	12.7	0.0	11.5	17.5	14.2	18.7	41.6	23.7	27.3	16.4	10.8	13.2
121-140	1.4	0.6	0.8	4.0	0.0	1.5	5.8	6.5	1.6	5.1	0.0	0.0	4.1	3.5	1.5
141 or more	0.5	31.2	9.8	5.0	38.2	10.3	6.5	11.3	5.2	2.8	23.7	0.0	4.2	21.7	8.1
Undetermined	0.0	2.3	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	3.2	0.0	5.2	0.0	15.2	2.2	2.2	0.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

1/ Items may not add to total because of rounding; sample expanded by plants. 2/ Percentages calculated from rounded data.

Table 6--Employees with working spouses, by resident and migrant class, four study areas, 1970

Resident class	Number of employees with working spouse 1/				
	Arizona	Upper Coastal	Ozarks	Delta	Total
			Number 2/		
Residents	200	1,069	582	316	2,167
Migrants	32	55	182	19	286
Returnees	30	189	112	15	345
Total 3/	275	1,323	882	348	2,828
			Percent 4/		
Residents	21.1	50.8	43.7	39.1	41.7
Migrants	18.5	42.0	48.9	50.0	40.1
Returnees	22.7	55.8	44.4	45.5	45.6
All classes	21.7	50.9	44.5	39.6	42.0

1/ Excludes undetermined. 2/ Items may not add to total because of rounding; sample expanded by plants. 3/ Includes undetermined migrant class. 4/ Percentages calculated from rounded data, with base equal to total employees in each resident class in each area.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

0013

0013

Table 7--Real change in employees' weekly salary, 1970 job and first previous job, by resident and migrant class, four study areas

Real salary change (weekly) 1/	Arizona			Upper Coastal			Ozarks			Delta			Total		
	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees
Dollars							Number 2/								
-30 or less	43	7	8	67	20	112	48	48	27	9	5	14	168	79	161
-20 to -29	22	13	5	68	5	36	35	5	9	5	9	0	130	32	51
-10 to -19	11	16	7	105	0	11	50	40	16	24	14	5	189	70	39
-1 to -9	26	5	1	174	11	29	132	31	6	33	5	0	365	52	36
0	0	5	1	52	19	0	16	9	0	14	0	0	82	33	1
1 to 9	42	32	14	243	12	22	148	22	22	102	0	5	536	66	63
10 to 19	42	16	17	285	10	41	135	55	49	101	5	0	563	86	107
20 to 29	32	1	21	313	16	23	135	4	25	134	0	0	614	22	69
30 to 39	30	1	0	169	5	17	60	18	34	23	0	0	282	25	51
40 to 49	50	16	1	125	15	11	63	18	16	40	0	0	278	49	28
50 or more	490	45	31	406	11	30	187	50	35	176	0	5	1,259	105	100
Undetermined	161	15	25	96	5	8	322	72	12	147	0	5	726	93	49
Total	948	173	132	2,103	131	339	1,332	372	252	808	38	33	5,192	713	756
							Percent 3/								
-30 or less	4.5	4.0	6.1	3.2	15.3	33.0	3.6	12.9	10.7	1.1	13.2	42.4	3.2	11.1	21.3
-20 to -29	2.3	7.5	3.8	3.2	3.8	10.6	2.6	1.3	3.6	0.6	23.7	0.0	2.5	4.5	6.7
-10 to -19	1.2	9.2	5.3	5.0	0.0	3.2	3.8	10.8	6.3	3.0	36.8	15.2	3.6	9.8	5.2
-1 to -9	2.7	2.9	0.8	8.3	8.4	8.6	9.9	8.3	2.4	4.1	13.2	0.0	7.0	7.3	4.8
0	0.0	2.9	0.8	2.5	14.5	0.0	1.2	2.4	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.6	4.6	0.1
1 to 9	4.4	18.5	10.6	11.6	9.2	6.5	11.1	5.9	8.7	12.6	0.0	15.2	10.3	9.3	8.3
10 to 19	4.4	9.2	12.9	13.6	7.6	12.1	10.1	14.8	19.4	12.5	13.2	0.0	10.8	12.1	14.2
20 to 29	3.4	0.6	15.9	14.9	12.2	6.8	10.1	1.1	9.9	16.6	0.0	0.0	11.8	3.1	9.1
30 to 39	3.2	0.6	0.0	8.0	3.8	5.0	4.5	4.8	13.5	2.8	0.0	0.0	5.4	3.5	6.7
40 to 49	5.3	9.2	0.8	5.9	11.5	3.2	4.7	4.8	6.3	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	6.9	3.7
50 or more	51.7	26.0	23.5	19.3	8.4	8.8	14.0	13.4	13.9	21.8	0.0	15.2	24.2	14.7	13.2
Undetermined	17.0	8.7	18.9	4.6	3.8	2.4	24.2	19.4	4.8	18.2	0.0	15.2	14.0	13.0	6.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

1/ All salaries were inflated to a 1970 base, using the CPI. Data include workers with no previous job.

2/ Items may not add to total because of rounding; sample expanded by plants.

3/ Percentages calculated from rounded data.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 8--Real change in employees' annual household income, 1970 job and first previous job, by resident and migrant class, four study areas

Real household income change 1/	Arizona			Upper Coastal			Ozarks			Delta			Total		
	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees
Dollars							Number 2/								
-2,000 or less	35	6	8	127	16	67	63	61	15	27	0	9	252	83	99
-1,500 to -1,999	4	3	1	28	0	33	9	0	9	5	0	0	46	3	43
-1,000 to -1,499	16	12	3	41	6	10	21	12	0	9	9	0	86	39	13
-500 to -999	3	7	1	87	0	21	41	0	0	0	5	0	130	12	22
-1 to -499	15	0	0	181	0	22	73	0	7	43	0	0	312	0	29
0	12	13	1	160	45	30	126	49	9	37	0	0	335	108	40
1 to 499	5	5	1	149	0	27	58	8	9	64	0	0	275	13	37
500 to 999	24	5	4	243	13	5	109	5	38	83	14	5	458	36	52
1,000 to 1,499	11	16	11	107	10	8	87	21	30	24	5	0	228	52	48
1,500 to 1,999	26	13	0	143	9	15	109	10	17	28	5	0	306	38	32
2,000 to 2,499	13	1	1	125	5	15	99	23	8	82	0	0	319	30	25
2,500 to 2,999	15	0	3	110	5	14	34	13	0	91	0	0	249	19	16
3,000 to 3,499	0	10	1	124	0	11	78	16	0	46	0	5	247	27	17
3,500 to 3,999	12	1	15	60	0	0	31	20	4	86	0	0	189	21	19
4,000 or more	20	17	7	242	11	45	168	43	38	133	0	15	562	71	105
Undetermined	739	63	73	180	10	18	227	90	68	51	0	0	1,198	163	158
Total	948	173	132	2,103	131	339	1,332	372	252	808	38	33	5,192	713	756
							Percent 3/								
-2,000 or less	3.7	3.5	6.1	6.0	12.2	19.8	4.7	16.4	6.0	3.3	0.0	27.3	4.9	11.6	13.1
-1,500 to -1,999	0.4	1.7	0.8	1.3	0.0	9.7	0.7	0.0	3.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.4	5.7
-1,000 to -1,499	1.7	6.9	2.3	1.9	4.6	2.9	1.6	3.2	0.0	1.1	23.7	0.0	1.7	5.5	1.7
-500 to -999	0.3	4.0	0.8	4.1	0.0	6.2	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.2	0.0	2.5	1.7	2.9
-1 to -499	1.6	0.0	0.0	8.6	0.0	6.5	5.5	0.0	2.8	5.3	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	3.8
0	1.3	7.5	0.8	7.6	34.4	8.8	9.5	13.2	3.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	6.5	15.1	5.3
1 to 499	0.5	2.9	0.8	7.1	0.0	8.0	4.4	2.2	3.6	7.9	0.0	0.0	5.3	1.8	4.9
500 to 999	2.5	2.9	3.0	11.6	9.9	1.5	8.2	1.3	15.1	10.3	36.8	15.2	8.8	5.0	6.9
1,000 to 1,499	1.2	9.2	8.3	5.1	7.6	2.4	6.5	5.6	11.9	3.0	13.2	0.0	4.4	7.3	6.3
1,500 to 1,999	2.7	7.5	0.0	6.8	6.9	4.4	8.2	2.7	6.7	3.5	13.2	0.0	5.9	5.3	4.2
2,000 to 2,499	1.4	0.6	0.8	5.9	3.8	4.4	7.4	6.2	3.2	10.1	0.0	0.0	6.1	4.2	3.3
2,500 to 2,999	1.6	0.0	2.3	5.2	3.8	4.1	2.6	3.5	0.0	11.3	0.0	0.0	4.8	2.7	2.1
3,000 to 3,499	0.0	5.8	0.8	5.9	0.0	3.2	5.9	4.3	0.0	5.7	0.0	15.2	4.8	3.8	2.2
3,500 to 3,999	1.3	0.6	11.4	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.3	5.4	1.6	10.6	0.0	0.0	3.6	2.9	2.5
4,000 or more	2.1	9.8	5.3	11.5	8.4	13.3	12.6	11.6	15.1	16.5	0.0	45.5	10.8	10.0	13.9
Undetermined	78.0	36.4	55.3	8.6	7.6	5.3	17.0	24.2	27.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	23.1	22.9	20.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

1/ All incomes were inflated to a 1970 base, using the CPI. Data include workers with no previous job. 2/ Items may not add to total because of rounding; sample expanded by plants. 3/ Percentages calculated from rounded data.

0022

0023

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 9--Number of civilian jobs held by employees from 1965 to 1970, by resident and migrant class, four study areas

Number of civilian jobs 1/	Arizona			Upper Coastal			Ozarks			Delta			Total		
	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees
							Number 2/								
1	596	50	41	687	16	21	444	57	24	363	0	10	2,091	123	96
2	264	29	54	825	63	166	522	107	120	324	14	14	1,934	213	353
3	63	68	26	444	31	87	268	176	86	103	10	10	877	285	210
4 or more	13	26	10	139	21	65	82	32	21	19	14	0	253	92	97
Undetermined	12	0	0	8	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	37	0	0
Total	948	173	132	2,103	131	339	1,332	372	252	808	38	33	5,192	713	756
							Percent 3/								
1	62.9	28.9	31.1	32.7	12.2	6.2	33.3	15.3	9.5	44.9	0.0	30.3	40.3	17.3	12.7
2	27.8	16.8	40.9	39.2	48.1	49.0	39.2	28.8	47.6	40.1	36.8	42.4	37.2	29.9	46.7
3	6.6	39.3	19.7	21.1	23.7	25.7	20.1	47.3	34.1	12.7	26.3	30.3	16.9	40.0	27.8
4 or more	1.4	15.0	7.6	6.6	16.0	19.2	6.2	8.6	8.3	2.4	36.8	0.0	4.9	12.9	12.8
Undetermined	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

1/ Includes present job.

2/ Items may not add to total because of rounding; sample expanded by plants.

3/ Percentages calculated from rounded data.

0024

0025

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 10--Employees' reasons for leaving previous job, by resident and migrant class, four study areas

Reasons for leaving previous job 1/	Arizona			Upper Coastal			Ozarks			Delta			Total		
	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees
							Number 2/								
Pull of new job	80	58	35	607	43	60	220	55	45	238	0	0	1,146	155	139
Push from old job	88	37	6	342	22	65	266	118	23	104	32	15	799	210	108
Dissatisfied	10	6	14	152	10	32	176	24	34	23	0	0	361	41	80
Health	19	3	1	82	5	10	12	0	5	10	0	0	122	7	16
Military-education	72	29	8	120	5	13	74	3	18	19	0	5	285	37	43
Family reasons	52	8	16	95	23	62	71	35	57	18	0	0	237	66	135
Living conditions	1	0	0	19	12	72	0	24	30	5	0	9	25	36	111
Other	627	33	52	686	11	26	514	113	41	391	5	5	2,218	161	123
Total	948	173	132	2,103	131	339	1,332	372	252	808	38	33	5,192	713	756
							Percent 3/								
Pull of new job	8.4	33.5	26.5	28.9	32.8	17.7	16.5	14.8	17.9	29.5	0.0	0.0	22.1	21.7	18.4
Push from old job	9.3	21.4	4.5	16.3	16.8	19.2	20.0	31.7	9.1	12.9	84.2	45.5	15.4	29.5	14.3
Dissatisfied	1.1	3.5	10.6	7.2	7.6	9.4	13.2	6.5	13.5	2.8	0.0	0.0	7.0	5.8	10.6
Health	2.0	1.7	0.8	3.9	3.8	2.9	0.9	0.0	2.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	2.3	1.0	2.1
Military-education	7.6	16.8	6.1	5.7	3.8	3.8	5.6	0.8	7.1	2.4	0.0	15.2	5.5	5.2	5.7
Family reasons	5.5	4.6	12.1	4.5	17.6	18.3	5.3	9.4	22.6	2.2	0.0	0.0	4.6	9.3	17.9
Living conditions	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.9	9.2	21.2	0.0	6.5	11.9	0.6	0.0	27.3	0.5	5.0	14.7
Other	66.1	19.1	39.4	32.6	8.4	7.7	38.6	30.4	16.3	48.4	13.2	15.2	42.7	22.6	16.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

1/ Pull of a new job includes promotions, transfers, and perceived personal betterment; push from an old job includes firings, seasonal layoffs, and business closings; dissatisfied includes quitting and retirements; military-education includes entering or leaving military or school; family reasons include transfers of spouses, marriages, pregnancies, and caring for relations; living conditions include economic living costs and area amenities; other includes the long-time unemployed, continuously employed at same plant, and undetermined.

2/ Items may not add to total because of rounding; sample expanded by plants.

3/ Percentages calculated from rounded data.

0026

002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 11--Employees' ages, by resident and migrant class, four study areas, 1970

Age	Arizona			Upper Coastal			Ozarks			Delta			Total		
	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees
							Number 1/								
0-19	30	0	5	125	13	0	89	17	13	0	0	0	244	30	19
20-29	554	95	78	833	62	164	502	174	136	354	14	10	2,243	345	387
30-39	261	50	47	531	50	120	263	66	59	281	14	5	1,337	180	231
40-49	94	11	0	415	0	21	268	61	20	98	5	19	864	77	60
50 or more	5	17	0	186	5	34	198	38	19	75	5	0	464	65	53
Undetermined	15	0	1	13	0	0	12	17	5	0	0	0	39	17	6
Total	948	173	132	2,103	131	339	1,332	372	252	808	38	33	5,192	713	756
							Percent 2/								
0-19	3.2	0.0	3.8	5.9	9.0	0.0	6.7	4.6	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	4.2	2.5
20-29	58.4	54.9	59.1	39.6	47.3	48.4	37.7	46.8	54.0	43.8	36.8	30.3	43.2	48.4	51.2
30-39	27.5	28.9	35.6	25.2	38.2	35.4	19.7	17.7	23.4	34.8	36.8	15.2	25.8	25.2	30.6
40-49	8.9	6.4	0.0	19.7	0.0	6.2	20.1	16.4	7.9	12.1	13.2	57.6	16.6	10.8	7.9
50 or more	0.5	9.8	0.0	8.8	3.8	10.0	14.9	10.2	7.5	9.3	13.2	0.0	8.9	9.1	7.0
Undetermined	1.6	0.0	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.9	4.6	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	2.4	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

1/ Items may not add to total because of rounding; sample expanded by plants.

2/ Percentages calculated from rounded data.

0028

0028

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 12--Employees' years of formal education, by resident and migrant class, four study areas, 1970

Years of education	Arizona			Upper Coastal			Ozarks			Delta			Total		
	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees
							Number 1/								
4 or less	72	10	3	35	0	11	28	0	0	36	0	0	170	10	13
5-7	132	15	38	206	0	22	21	15	5	133	5	9	492	36	74
8	121	17	6	329	5	33	194	39	11	116	14	5	759	75	55
9-11	218	30	18	504	24	95	383	61	63	299	5	5	1,405	119	181
12	362	45	33	846	57	132	595	138	126	216	5	14	2,018	245	305
13-15	40	39	23	160	16	34	90	72	36	9	9	0	299	136	93
16 or more	1	16	1	16	29	13	23	47	10	0	0	0	40	92	24
Undetermined	1	0	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	10
Total	948	173	132	2,103	131	339	1,332	372	252	808	38	33	5,192	713	756
							Percent 2/								
4 or less	7.6	5.8	2.3	1.7	0.0	3.2	2.1	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	3.3	1.4	1.7
5-7	13.9	8.7	28.8	9.8	0.0	6.5	1.6	4.0	2.0	16.5	13.2	27.3	9.5	5.0	9.8
8	12.8	9.8	4.5	15.6	3.8	9.7	14.6	10.5	4.4	14.4	36.8	15.2	14.6	10.5	7.3
9-11	23.0	17.3	13.6	24.0	18.3	28.0	28.8	16.4	25.0	37.0	13.2	15.2	27.1	16.7	23.9
12	38.2	26.0	25.0	40.2	43.5	38.9	44.7	37.1	50.0	26.7	13.2	42.4	38.9	34.4	40.3
13-15	4.2	22.5	17.4	7.6	12.2	10.0	6.8	19.4	14.3	1.1	23.7	0.0	5.8	19.1	12.3
16 or more	0.1	9.2	0.8	0.8	22.1	3.8	1.7	12.6	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	12.9	3.2
Undetermined	0.1	0.0	7.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

1/ Items may not add to total because of rounding; sample expanded by plants. 2/ Percentages calculated from rounded data.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 13--Commuting distances of employees, by resident and migrant class, four study areas, 1970

One-way mileage	Arizona			Upper Coastal			Ozarks			Delta			Total		
	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees	Residents	Migrants	Returnees
							Number 1/								
0-4	459	91	91	642	52	94	514	201	106	214	5	5	1,830	349	296
5-9	207	20	14	512	45	89	292	88	28	163	14	15	1,173	167	146
10-19	57	0	7	622	18	133	328	75	89	304	14	14	1,311	107	242
20-29	72	0	0	283	15	16	136	9	23	58	5	0	550	28	39
30-39	47	54	17	27	0	8	42	0	6	51	0	0	166	54	30
40 or more	96	7	3	8	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	116	7	3
Undetermined	10	1	0	10	0	0	8	0	0	18	0	0	47	1	0
Total	948	173	132	2,103	131	339	1,332	372	252	808	38	33	5,192	713	756
							Percent 2/								
0-4	48.4	52.6	68.9	30.5	39.7	27.7	38.6	54.0	42.1	26.5	13.2	15.2	35.2	48.9	39.2
5-9	21.8	11.6	10.6	24.3	34.4	26.3	21.9	23.7	11.1	20.2	36.8	45.5	22.6	23.4	19.3
10-19	6.0	0.0	5.3	29.6	13.7	39.2	24.6	20.2	35.3	37.6	36.8	42.4	25.3	15.0	32.0
20-29	7.6	0.0	0.0	13.5	11.5	4.7	10.2	2.4	9.1	7.2	13.2	0.0	10.6	3.9	5.2
30-39	5.0	31.2	12.9	1.3	0.0	2.4	3.2	0.0	2.4	6.3	0.0	0.0	3.2	7.6	4.0
40 or more	10.1	4.0	2.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	1.0	0.4
Undetermined	1.1	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.1	0.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

1/ Items may not add to total because of rounding; sample expanded by plants.

2/ Percentages calculated from rounded data.

0032 0033

BEST COPY AVAILABLE